



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/511,316	02/23/2000	Yasuyoshi Saito	0068-0405-0	4089

7590

11/30/2001

Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, P.C.
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway
Fourth Floor
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER

KOSLOW, CAROL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1755

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2001

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

80V-14

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/511,316

Applicant(s)

SAITO, YASUYOSHI

Examiner

C. Melissa Koslow

Art Unit

1755

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 November 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☒ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the objection to the specification.
4. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 15, 16, 22 and 23 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 15-18.

Claim(s) rejected: 13, 14 and 19-29.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 23 November 2001 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet


C. Melissa Koslow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1755

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the amendment to claim 17 raises the question of new matter since the examples only support CuO as an additive. The lithium carbonate and tantalum oxide in example 2 were added to produce the niobate ceramic $(\text{Li,K,Na})(\text{Nb,Ta})\text{O}_3$. There were not added as additives to $(\text{Li,K,Na})(\text{Nb,Ta})\text{O}_3$. The phrase "said blended powder of a niobate" lacks antecedent basis in claims 25 and 30. Also in claim 30, $(\text{Li,K,Na})(\text{Nb,Ta})\text{O}_3$ is not a niobate represented by the formula ANbO_3 .

Continuation of 10. Other: It is noted that the proposed amendment to claim 25 would not overcome the art rejection over JP 55-55589 since claim 25 allows for the additive to be lithium.

Since newly proposed claims 15, 16, 22 and 23 would be allowable if submitted in an amendment canceling claims 13, 14, 19-21 and 25-28, claims 17, 18, 24 and 29, as presented in the amendment of 21 June 2001, would also be allowable.